



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/970,702	10/05/2001	Hajime Takei	018656-252	1791

7590 11/09/2005

Platon N. Mandros  
BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.  
P.O. Box 1404  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404

EXAMINER

MURPHY, DILLON J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

DATE MAILED: 11/09/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/970,702	<b>Applicant(s)</b> TAKEI ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Dillon J. Murphy	<b>Art Unit</b> 2624	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 9/15/2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 05 October 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/25/2002.

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

DOUGLAS Q. TRAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

*Tran*

### **DETAILED ACTION**

- This action is responsive to the amendment filed on September 15, 2005.
- Claims 1-15 are pending.
- Amendments to the specification are acknowledged

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

Applicant's amendments to claims 7, 8 and 9 have been noted and the 35 U.S.C. 101 rejections have been withdrawn.

#### ***Claim Objections***

Applicant's amendments to overcome minor informalities have been noted in regards to claims 1-9. Therefore the objections to claims 1-9 have been withdrawn.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being clearly anticipated by Hansen (U.S. 6,509,974 B1).

With regard to claim 1, Hansen teaches a printing system comprising an on-line client (Figure 1a, showing a Client PC in the Print Shop Client), print server (Figure 1b, showing print server #120), and printer (Figure 1b, showing a plurality of production print devices #122 including an XYZ Printer), as well as an off-line finishing device (Figure 1b, XYZ Off-line Finishing Device #122) wherein the print server includes:

First memory means (Figure 1b, computer hard drive of print server #120) for storing specifications of the printer and of the finishing device as well as information regarding options installed thereon (Workflow software is programmed with data about different production output devices, column 11, lines 26-33, stored in the job-prep workstation, column 8, lines 47-50, wherein the job-prep workstation is coupled with the print server, column 7, lines 11-13);

Receiving means for receiving from the client data pertaining to a job ticket that includes at least finish specifics for printing to be executed (jobs received by a print server contain "flags/attributes," column 18, lines 29-35, which specify production output device instructions and parameters, as well as other finishing steps which may or not be automated, column 11, lines 64-67 and column 12, lines 1 and 2);

Sorting means for, based on the information regarding the specifications and installed options that is stored in the first memory means, separating the finishing specifics included in the job ticket received by the receiving means into those to be performed by the printer and those to be performed by the finishing device (Hansen

Art Unit: 2624

teaches a print system wherein the print server directs the jobs to specific production output devices based on attributes of print jobs and how attributes are satisfied by print engine, column 7, lines 30-42);

Setting means for setting in the printer parameters for the finishing specifics separated by the sorting means and assigned to the printer (prepared documents are passed along with print tickets to production output devices, column 8, lines 34-42), and

Creating means for creating data for a finishing device job ticket that includes the finishing specifics separated by the sorting means and assigned to the finishing device (Workflow management software includes means for creation and manipulation of job tickets and printing, column 9, lines 20-28).

With regard to claim 2, which depends from claim 1, Hansen further teaches a printing system wherein the print server further includes transmitting means for transmitting to the printer the data pertaining to the finishing device job ticket created by the creating means so as to print the finishing device job ticket (ticket may be either electronic or hard copy, column 4, lines 46-52, and tickets are sent to production output devices for final production, column 12, lines 31-33).

With regard to claim 4, Hansen teaches a print server to be used in a printing system including an on-line client (Figure 1a, showing a Client PC in the Print Shop Client), print server (Figure 1b, showing print server #120), and printer (Figure 1b, showing a plurality of production print devices #122 including an XYZ Printer), as well as an off-line finishing device (Figure 1b, XYZ Off-line Finishing Device #122) the print server comprising:

Art Unit: 2624

First memory means (Figure 1b, computer hard drive of print server #120) workflow software is programmed with data about different production output devices (column 11, lines 26-33))) for storing specifications of the printer and of the finishing device as well as information regarding options installed thereon (Workflow software is programmed with data about different production output devices, column 11, lines 26-33, stored in the job-prep workstation, column 8, lines 47-50, wherein the job-prep workstation is coupled with the print server, column 7, lines 11-13);

Receiving means for receiving from the client data pertaining to a job ticket that includes at least finish specifics for printing to be executed (jobs received by a print server contain "flags/attributes," column 18, lines 29-35, which specify production output device instructions and parameters, as well as other finishing steps which may or not be automated, column 11, lines 64-67 and column 12, lines 1 and 2);

Sorting means for, based on the information regarding the specifications and installed options that is stored in the first memory means, separating the finishing specifics included in the job ticket received by the receiving means into those to be performed by the printer and those to be performed by the finishing device (directing the jobs to specific production output devices based on attributes of print jobs and how attributes are satisfied by print engine, column 7, lines 30-42);

Setting means for setting in the printer parameters for the finishing specifics separated by the sorting means and assigned to the printer (prepared documents are passed along with print tickets to production output devices, column 8, lines 34-42); and

Creating means for creating data for a finishing device job ticket that includes the finishing specifics separated by the sorting means and assigned to the finishing device (Workflow management software includes means for creation and manipulation of job tickets and printing, column 9, lines 20-28).

With regard to claim 5, which depends from claim 4, Hansen further teaches:

A print server, further comprising transmitting means for transmitting to the printer the data pertaining to the finishing device job ticket created by the creating means so as to print the finishing device job ticket [ticket may be either electronic or hard copy (column 4, lines 46-52), and tickets are sent to production output devices for final production, column 12, lines 31-33).

With regard to claim 7, Hansen teaches a computer program (computer program, column 8, lines 47-58 and column 7, lines 20-24) in a computer readable medium to be used in a printing system which includes an on-line client (Figure 1a showing in the Print Shop Client a Client PC) and printer (Figure 1b, XYZ Printer #122) as well as an off-line finishing device (Figure 1b, XYZ Off-line Finishing Device #122), and which executes a print job based on a job ticket including at least finishing specifics for printing to be executed (column 2, lines 43 and 44), the computer program cause a computer execute processing comprising the steps of:

Receiving the job ticket from the client (receiving information from scanner or a program on a client computer in various formats, column 9, lines 29-39);

Separating the finishing specifics included in the received job ticket into those to be performed by the printer and those to be performed by the finishing device, based on

Art Unit: 2624

information regarding specifications and installed options of the printer and finishing device that is stored in first memory means (directing the jobs to specific production output devices based on attributes of print jobs and how attributes are satisfied by print engine, column 7, lines 30-42);

Setting in the printer parameters for the finishing specifics separated and assigned to the printer (prepared documents are passed along with print tickets to production output devices, column 8, lines 34-42); and

Creating data for a finishing device job ticket that includes the finishing specifics separated and assigned to the finishing device (Workflow management software includes means for creation and manipulation of job tickets and printing, column 9, lines 20-28).

With regard to claim 8, which depends from claim 7, Hansen further teaches that the processing further comprises a step of transmitting to the printer the created data pertaining to the finishing device job ticket so as to print the finishing device job ticket (ticket may be either electronic or hard copy, column 4, lines 46-52, and tickets are sent to production output devise for final production, column 12, lines 31-33).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.



Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (U.S. 6,509,974 B1) as applied to claim 2 above, and further in view of Rourke (U.S. 4,970,554) and Jeyachandran et al. (U.S. 6,567,176 B1).

Regarding claim 3, which depends from claim 2, Hansen teaches a first memory means, a receiving means, a sorting means, a setting means, a creating means, and a transmitting means, as discussed above, while also teaching an on-line scanner (Figure 1a, #116) to be used in a printing system (Figure 1a and 1b, #112). Furthermore, Hansen also teaches a second memory means for storing job information and user information included in the job ticket received by the receiving means (Hansen saves documents and all of the associated tickets, column 12, lines 24-26. Saving occurs on print server #116, Document Library #114, and on computer workstation #114 of Figure 1a.). Hansen does not teach a reading. However, Rourke teaches a reading means for reading the job information from the data obtained by reading via the scanner the finishing device job ticket printed by the printer (Rourke scans the job tickets to identify the job numbers associated with specific documents, column 4, lines 38-48).

Hansen and Rourke are combinable because they are in the same field of endeavor of print job processing and printing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the reading means of Rourke to the first memory means, receiving means, sorting means, setting means, creating means, transmitting means, and on-line scanner of Hansen. The motivation for doing so would have been to decrease the number of manual steps of job preparation the operator must normally encounter (Hansen, column 19, lines 62-64), provide direction to

Art Unit: 2624

operators and allow them to efficiently manage the jobs through job tickets (Rourke, column 1, lines 26-36).

The combination of Hansen and Rourke does not teach a notifying means. However, Jeyachandran teaches a notifying means for calling the user information stored in the second memory means based on the job information read by the reading means and notifying the client of job completion based on the user information (scanner reads in job and job information, transmits data to printer to be printed, and once printing is completed, notifies user that instructed job was performed based on information stored in memory, column 21, lines 7-15 and column 20, lines 46-52).

Hansen, Rourke, and Jeyachandran are combinable because they are all in the same field of endeavor of network printing and finishing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the notifying means of Jeyachandran to the combination of Hansen and Rourke comprising of first memory means, receiving means, sorting means, setting means, creating means, transmitting means, reading means, and on-line scanner. The motivation for doing so would have been to decrease the number of manual steps of job preparation the operator must normally encounter (Hansen, column 19, lines 62-64), to provide direction to operators and allow them to efficiently manage the jobs through job tickets (Rourke, column 1, lines 26-36), to allow an external device to acquire and output information to be processed (Jeyachandran, column 2, lines 57-61), and to provide a printing apparatus that can perform printing by employing appropriate printing parameters consonant with the processing objective, without a complex operation being required

Art Unit: 2624

(Jeyachandran, column 2, lines 38-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hansen with Rourke and Jeyachandran to obtain the invention as specified in claim 3.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (U.S. 6,509,974 B1) as applied to claim 5 above, and further in view of Rourke (U.S. 4,970,554) and Jeyachandran et al. (U.S. 6,567,176 B1).

Regarding claim 6, which depends from claim 5, Hansen teaches a first memory means, a receiving means, a sorting means, a setting means, a creating means, and a transmitting means, as discussed above, while also teaching an print server (Figure 1b, #120) (to be used in a printing system) wherein the printing system further includes an on-line scanner (Figure 1b, #116). Furthermore, Hansen also teaches a second memory means for storing job information and user information included in the job ticket received by the receiving means (Hansen saves documents and all of the associated tickets, column 12, lines 24-26. Saving occurs on print server #116, Document Library #114, and on computer workstation #114 of Figure 1a.). Hansen does not teach a reading means or a notifying means. However, Rourke teaches a reading means for reading the job information from the data obtained by reading via the scanner the finishing device job ticket printed by the printer (Rourke scans the job tickets to identify the job numbers associated with specific documents, column 4, lines 38-48).

Hansen and Rourke are combinable because they are in the same field of endeavor of print job processing and printing. At the time of the invention, it would have

Art Unit: 2624

been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the reading means of Rourke to the first memory means, receiving means, sorting means, setting means, creating means, transmitting means, and on-line scanner of Hansen. The motivation for doing so would have been to decrease the number of manual steps of job preparation the operator must normally encounter (Hansen, column 19, lines 62-64), provide direction to operators and allow them to efficiently manage the jobs through job tickets (Rourke, column 1, lines 26-36).

The combination of Hansen and Rourke does not teach a notifying means. However, Jeyachandran teaches a notifying means for calling the user information stored in the second memory means based on the job information read by the reading means and notifying the client of job completion based on the user information (scanner reads in job and job information, transmits data to printer to be printed, and once printing is completed, notifies user that instructed job was performed based on information stored in memory, column 21, lines 7-15 and column 20, lines 46-52).

Hansen, Rourke, and Jeyachandran are combinable because they are all in the same field of endeavor of network printing and finishing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the notifying means of Jeyachandran to the combination of Hansen and Rourke comprising of first memory means, receiving means, sorting means, setting means, creating means, transmitting means, reading means, and on-line scanner. The motivation for doing so would have been to decrease the number of manual steps of job preparation the operator must normally encounter (Hansen, column 19, lines 62-64), to provide direction

Art Unit: 2624

to operators and allow them to efficiently manage the jobs through job tickets (Rourke, column 1, lines 26-36), to allow an external device to acquire and output information to be processed (Jeyachandran, column 2, lines 57-61), and to provide a printing apparatus that can perform printing by employing appropriate printing parameters consonant with the processing objective, without a complex operation being required (Jeyachandran, column 2, lines 38-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hansen with Rourke and Jeyachandran to obtain the invention as specified in claim 6.

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (U.S. 6,509,974 B1) as applied to claim 8 above, and further in view of Rourke (U.S. 4,970,554) and Jeyachandran et al. (U.S. 6,567,176 B1).

Regarding claim 9, which depends from claim 8, Hansen teaches a computer program recorded in a computer-readable recording medium capable of receiving, separating, setting, creating, and transmitting, as discussed above, while also teaching an on-line scanner (Figure 1a, #116) to be used in a printing system (Figures 1a and 1b, #112). Furthermore, Hansen also teaches that the processing further comprises the steps of storing job information and user information included in the receiving job ticket into second memory means (Hansen saves documents and all of the associated tickets, column 12, lines 40-42. Saving occurs on print server #116, Document Library #114, and on computer workstation #114 of Figure 1a.). Hansen does not disclose reading the job information from the data obtained by reading the finishing device job ticket

Art Unit: 2624

printed by the printer. However, Rourke teaches of reading the job information from the data obtained by reading the finishing device job ticket printed by the printer (Rourke scans the job tickets to identify the job numbers associated with specific documents, column 4, lines 38-48. Processing also occurs on a computer in an electronic job program file, column 3, lines 53-56).

Hansen and Rourke are combinable because they are in the same field of endeavor of print job processing and printing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the reading means of Rourke to the receiving means, separating means, setting means, creating means, transmitting means, storing means, and on-line scanner of Hansen. The motivation for doing so would have been to use a computer program on a computer readable medium to decrease the number of manual steps of job preparation the operator must normally encounter (Hansen, column 19, lines 62-64), provide direction to operators and allow them to efficiently manage the jobs through job tickets (Rourke, column 1, lines 26-36).

The combination of Hansen and Rourke does not teach a computer program on a computer readable medium comprising the steps of calling the user information and notifying the client. However, Jeyachandran teaches a the processing steps which comprises of calling the user information stored in the second memory means based on the read job information and notifying the client of job completion based on the user information (operating as a program on a computer, scanner reads in job and job information, transmits data to printer to be printed, and once printing is completed,

Art Unit: 2624

notifies user that instructed job was performed based on information stored in memory, column 21, lines 7-15 and column 20, lines 46-52, Figure 16a).

Hansen, Rourke, and Jeyachandran are combinable because they are all in the same field of endeavor of network printing and finishing. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to add the notifying means of Jeyachandran to the combination of Hansen and Rourke comprising of a computer program on a computer readable medium of first memory means, receiving means, sorting means, setting means, creating means, transmitting means, reading means, and on-line scanner. The motivation for doing so would have been to decrease the number of manual steps of job preparation the operator must normally encounter (Hansen, column 19, lines 62-64), to provide direction to operators and allow them to efficiently manage the jobs through job tickets (Rourke, column 1, lines 26-36), to allow an external device to acquire and output information to be processed (Jeyachandran, column 2, lines 57-61), and to provide a printing apparatus that can perform printing by employing appropriate printing parameters consonant with the processing objective, without a complex operation being required (Jeyachandran, column 2, lines 38-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hansen with Rourke and Jeyachandran to obtain the invention as specified in claim 9.

Claims 10, 11, and 13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (U.S. 6,509,974 B1), and further in view of Ryan et al. (US 2002/0078012), hereafter referred to as Hansen and Ryan.

Regarding claim 10, Hansen teaches a printing system comprising an on-line client (Hansen, fig 1a, showing a Client PC in the Print Shop Client), print server (Hansen, fig 1b, showing print server #120) and printer (Hansen, fig 1b, showing a plurality of production print devices #122 including an XYZ Printer), and an off-line finishing device (Hansen, fig 1b, XYZ Off-line Finishing Device #122), wherein the print server includes:

A memory (Hansen, fig 1b, computer hard drive of print server #120) for storing specifications of the printer and the finishing device (Hansen, workflow software is programmed with data about different production output devices, column 11, lines 26-33, stored in the job-prep workstation, column 8, lines 47-50, wherein the job-prep workstation is coupled with the print server, column 7, lines 11-13); and

A processor that separates finishing specifics included in a received job ticket (Hansen, jobs received by a print server contain "flags/attributes," column 18, lines 29-35, which specify production output device instructions and parameters, as well as other finishing steps which may or not be automated, column 11, lines 64-67 and column 12, lines 1 and 2), wherein the finishing specifics are separated and assigned to specific output devices (Hansen, col 7, ln 1-42, print production sends jobs to specific printer in terms of finishing specifics). Hansen does not expressly disclose a processor that separates finishing specifics included in a received job ticket into those to be performed by the printer and those to be performed by the finishing device, based on the specifications stored in said memory, provides the printer with the parameters for the separated finishing specifics to be performed by the printer, and generates a job ticket



Art Unit: 2624

that includes the separated finishing specifics to be performed by the finishing device.

Ryan, however, specifically discloses a processor that separates finishing specifics included in a received job ticket into those to be performed by the printer and those to be performed by the finishing device, based on the specifications stored in said memory, provides the printer with the parameters for the separated finishing specifics to be performed by the printer, and generates a job ticket that includes the separated finishing specifics to be performed by the finishing device (Ryan, fig 6, description of finished product and product information, i.e. job ticket, is inputted into PMC, Production Monitor Control (which must inherently have a processor to function as described), and outputs of the PMC comprise Virtual Job Tickets. Regarding the location of the PMC, it would have been obvious to include the functionality of the PMC as taught by Ryan in the Print server as taught by Hansen. Regarding the Virtual Job Tickets, see paragraphs #53 and #54 of Ryan, teaching the generation of both a Virtual Print Job Ticket (VPJT) and Virtual Finishing Job Ticket (VFJT), wherein job tickets separately define printing and finishing specifics for the printer, and define finishing specifics for the finisher. Printers comprise their own finishing features (paragraph #58 and #59), therefore the PMC must sort and separate which finishing options are to be performed by the printer and the finisher. Additionally, Ryan teaches storing the finisher specifications in memory, #32. See also paragraph #72 of Ryan, wherein the job database comprises tables of printer and finisher functions, and selects among the presented functions to delegate tasks to the printer and finisher, i.e. separate finishing tasks between the printer and finisher).

Hansen and Ryan are combinable because they are from a similar field of endeavor of printing systems with off-line finishers. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the processor of Ryan that separates finishing specifics into those to be performed by the printer and those to be performed by the finisher with the printing system of Hansen comprising an on-line client, print server and printer, and an off-line finishing device. The motivation for doing so would have been to fill the void left by prior art by supplying a printing system that can divide and manage a print job and the associated work flow in response to constraints of both the available printing systems and the available finishing systems (Ryan, paragraph 28), as well as to decrease the number of manual steps of job preparation the operator must normally encounter (Hansen, column 19, lines 62-64). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Ryan with Hansen to obtain the invention as specified in claim 10.

Regarding claim 11, the combination of Hansen and Ryan further teach a printing system, wherein the print server further transmits to the printer the data pertaining to the job ticket generated by the processor to print the finishing device job ticket (Ryan, paragraph #60, wherein the Job Segment Identifier JSI is used to identify jobs and the associated features of the printing job. Also see paragraph #62, wherein the JSIS (Job Segment Identifier Sheet) is printed by one of the printing devices to be transferred to the finishing device for job completion. Inherently, the print data must have been sent to the printer for the hard copy to be output as taught by Ryan in paragraph #62).

Regarding claim 13, claim 13 recites identical limitations as 10. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 10 are equally applicable to claim 13.

Claims 12, 14, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hansen (U.S. 6,509,974 B1), and further in view of Ryan et al. (US 2002/0078012), and Jeyachandran et al. (US 6,567,176), hereafter referred to as Hansen, Ryan and Jeyachandran.

Regarding claim 12, which depends from claim 11, the combination of Hansen and Ryan teaches a printing system comprising an on-line client, print server and printer, and an off-line finishing device, wherein the server includes a memory for storing printer and finisher specifications, wherein the processor separates the finishing specifics into those to be performed by the printer and those to be performed by the finishing device, and wherein the print server further transmits to the printer the data for printing the finishing device job ticket, as explained above in the rejection of claim 11. Further, the combination of Hansen and Ryan teaches a memory for storing job information and user information included in the received job ticket (Ryan, paragraph 62, Job Segment Identifier Sheet may contain a pointer to a Virtual Finish Job Ticket Database storing job and user information. Furthermore, the combination of Hansen and Ryan teaches an on-line scanner (Ryan, fig 5, VFJTR (Virtual Finishing Job Ticket Reader) that reads job information on a job ticket printed by the printer. The combination of Hansen and Ryan does not disclose expressly a print system wherein said processor reads job information input by the scanner from the job ticket printed by

Art Unit: 2624

the printer, retrieves the user information stored in said memory based on the job information input by the scanner, and notifies the client of job completion based on the user information (Jeyachandran, col 20, ln 46-67, and col 21, ln 1-15, wherein scanner scans document and acquires job information. Information is input into a table, and job is completed using information. Upon completion of a job, user is notified (col 21, ln 13-16)).

Hansen, Ryan, and Jeyachandran are combinable because they are from a similar field of endeavor of printing control systems using job tickets in a production environment. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the system of Jeyachandran including the reading of job information from the scanner from the job ticket, retrieving the user information stored in memory, and notifying the user of completion with the combination of Hansen and Ryan comprising a printing system comprising an on-line client, print server and printer, and an off-line finishing device, wherein the server includes a memory for storing printer and finisher specifications, wherein the processor separates the finishing specifics into those to be performed by the printer and those to be performed by the finishing device, and wherein the print server further transmits to the printer the data for printing the finishing device job ticket. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow an external device to acquire and output information to be processed (Jeyachandran, column 2, lines 57-61), and to provide a printing apparatus that can perform printing by employing appropriate printing parameters consonant with the processing objective, without a complex operation being required (Jeyachandran,

Art Unit: 2624

column 2, lines 38-42). Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Jeyachandran with the combination of Hansen and Ryan to obtain the invention as specified in claim 12.

Regarding claim 14, which depends from claim 13, claim 14 recites identical limitations as 11. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 11 are equally applicable to claim 14.

Regarding claim 15, which depends from claim 5, claim 15 recites identical limitations as 12. Thus, arguments similar to that presented above for claim 12 are equally applicable to claim 15.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 9/15/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 1, applicant argues that Hansen does not disclose a sorting means in which the print server provides a sorting means, based on the information regarding the specifications stored in memory, for separating the finishing specifics included in the job ticket into those performed by the printer and those to be performed by the finishing device. Applicant claims that all finishing specifics are sent to the printer, wherein the printer determines which features it is capable of performing, and passing off the unfinished job to the offline finisher to be finished.

The Office notes, however, that Hansen does disclose the print server sorting means for sorting finishing specifics into those to be performed by the printer and those

Art Unit: 2624

to be performed by the finishing device. The Hansen patent discloses a print production stage (#108 of fig 1b), performed by the print server, wherein the output resources of the print shop are managed. Management includes queuing of jobs to the to the proper output devices (col 7, ln 1-42). By selecting an appropriate device to send a job, the operator is implicitly selecting that particular device to perform specific finishing options. Different output devices, #122 of fig 1b, comprise different printing and finishing capabilities. Queuing a print job to a specific printer separates printing and finishing operations to the printer, while any other finishing operations may be performed by an "XYZ Off-line Finishing Device" or a "HD Perfect Binder Off-line" to complete the job ticket. It is in this manner that by queuing jobs to different printers with known finishing characteristics, the print server is separating finishing specifics into those performed by the printer and the finisher. Accordingly, the server as taught by Hansen teaches setting, in the printer, the parameters for the finishing specifics as separated by the sorting means and assigned to the printer, and also teaches a creating means for creating data for a finishing device job ticket that includes the finishing specifics as separated by the sorting means and assigned to the finishing device.

Regarding the rejection of claims 3, 6, and 9, under 35 U.S.C. 103, the combination of Hansen, Rourke, and Jeyachandran teaches the claimed subject matter of the respective claims, and the rejections stand.

### ***Conclusion***

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The Allen et al. reference, US Patent 6,549,299, filed March 17, 2000, is cited for teaching a printing system wherein the host computer separates finishing specifics into those to be performed by the printer and those to be performed by the offline finishing device.

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dillon J. Murphy whose telephone number is (571) 272-5945. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on (571) 272-7437. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2624

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Dillon Murphy  
Dillon Murphy

DOUGLAS Q. TRAN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Tran